



**State of Rhode Island
Department of Administration / Division of Purchases
One Capitol Hill, Providence, Rhode Island 02908-5855
Tel: (401) 574-8100 Fax: (401) 574-8387**

**Solicitation Information
March 24, 2014**

ADDENDUM # 2

RFP # 7548513

**TITLE: Environmental Consulting Services to Support the Rhode Island Bays,
Rivers, and Watersheds Coordination Team: Upper Narragansett Bay Water
Quality Facilitated Stakeholders Process**

Submission Deadline Has Been Postponed until: Monday April, 7 2014 @ 11:30 am (Local Time)

Notice to Vendors:

Attached are the questions received with responses. No further questions will be answered.

**Thomas Bovis
Interdepartmental Project Manager**

Interested parties should monitor this website, on a regular basis, for any additional information that may be posted.

TITLE: Environmental Consulting Services to Support the Rhode Island Bays, Rivers, and Watersheds Coordination Team: Upper Narragansett Bay Water Quality Facilitated Stakeholders Process

Questions

Responses by Project Review Team, March 24, 2014

1. Task 1 states that the consultant will work with the PSC to complete an initial scoping of the alternative management strategies. Please clarify the role of the consultant. Is the consultant's role solely to facilitate discussions of the PSC as the PSC identifies the alternative management strategies and document the final list of strategies; or will the consultant also provide technical input on the selection of the alternative management strategies?

The PSC would expect the consultant to provide technical input on the selections and bring forward for discussion possible strategies not previously identified by the PSC. The set of alternative management strategies that will be considered is laid out in the RfP. In the opening paragraph describing Task 1, the sentence that lists the main strategies to be considered does state "Management strategies proposed for consideration are expected to include, but not be limited to". This last clause was inserted to ensure we have the opportunity to consider something entirely innovative that may be proposed by the consultant or other interested parties. Additionally, in the course of PSC and technical stakeholder discussions it is possible that one or more of the strategies will be deprioritized for consideration early on in the process.

The consultant will be expected to assist the PSC in Task 1 and the technical stakeholder group in subsequent tasks in assessing these alternative strategies so the consultant will provide technical input as we flesh out the applicability, feasibility, and cost information for each strategy. The consultant will be expected to document the final list and initial description of alternative management strategies produced by the PSC that the technical stakeholder will then examine in greater details.

2. Under Task 2, the consultant will "develop information sufficient to briefly describe pertinent information on each strategy identified for consideration in Task 1." Please define / list the type of information to be prepared by the consultant and include in the summary report / table of the management strategy options. Also, is the deliverable a summary report or summary table, or a summary report and summary table?

The pertinent information on each strategy to be provided in the technical memorandum produced by Task 1 and the summary report in Task 2 will in general concern the applicability, feasibility, and cost of each strategy. Task 3 describes the eight facets of each strategy that the technical stakeholder group will seek to elucidate. Those eight information areas represent the analytical focus of the project. The Task 1 technical memorandum and the Task 2 Summary report should be considered the initial steps in such analyses. Whether a summary report consists of just a 'summary table' or includes a summary table, is something the PSC would work out with the consultant. If it is just going to be a summary table, likely it would be a very detailed summary table.

3. Are the five (5) TSC meetings to be held under Task 3 different than the two (2) TSC meetings to be held under Task 2? In other words, is it seven (7) total TSC meetings (two under Task 2 and five under Task 3) or five (5) total TSC meetings (two under Task 2 and three more under Task 3)?

Task 1 entails two meetings of the PSC. Task 2 entails 1 inaugural meeting of the technical stakeholder group. Task 3 requires “a minimum” of 5 meetings of the technical stakeholder group. For tasks 2 and 3 combined, there will be at least 6 meetings of the technical stakeholder group.

4. For budgeting purposes, please identify the maximum number of management strategies to be evaluated under Task 3?

Task 1 excerpt: “Management strategies proposed for consideration are expected to include, but not be limited to, innovative green infrastructure designs and treatment systems, beneficial use of nutrients through aquaculture and shellfish restoration, restoration and creation of coastal wetlands, eelgrass and oyster beds, hydro-modifications (e.g. dam removal, modification of circulation patterns) and watershed-wide controls related to fertilizer use.”

Five basic alternative approaches to controlling the entry of nutrients into Narragansett Bay and its tributaries. In the course of our discussions in Tasks 1, 2, and 3, some of those alternative approaches may drop out, some of them may be broken out. For example, we may want to split “aquaculture and shellfish restoration” into two different approaches to examine each in greater detail. So, at this point we cannot identify the specific number of approaches other than to indicate they would encompass five approaches. Keep in mind too that we will not want the technical stakeholder group to spend an overly long time plowing through multiple approaches. This assessment should be completed in 12 months.

5. Task 3 states that the consultant will, among other things, quantify pollutant reduction potential for each of the management strategies. Is this to be based on existing information, or is the expectation for new analysis (e.g., modeling) to develop these estimates?

The RfP does not contemplate new receiving water modeling analyses as part of the assessment of alternative strategies. The consultant, PSC, and technical stakeholder group will need to rely upon existing information in quantifying estimates of pollutant reduction potential. The RfP does identify several receiving water modeling initiatives that include information that may be relevant to the task of quantifying pollutant reduction potential for each of the management strategies. The selected consultant is not expected to actually apply the referenced water quality models. Rather information related to certain aspects of the models may be of relevance to the assessment of strategies. For example, the 3VS model includes assumptions about the nitrogen loading from on-site wastewater system, etc. Task 3 states “The consultant, working with the TSC, will compile background and synthesize information and guidance on the potential efficacy of applying alternative management approaches to upper Narragansett Bay.” We would anticipate that respondents may elect to propose a variety of approaches to quantifying pollutant reduction potential as part of assessing the potential efficacy of management strategies; e.g. calculations, simplified models or other analytical tools that consultant may have available.

6. Task 4 mentions both report and reports (plural). Please clarify. Will the consultant develop one report or more than one report (and if more than one, how many)?

For each technical stakeholder meeting the consultant will produce a technical report or summary of the topic of the meeting. A draft report will be produced first for review by the PSC. A final technical report that responds adequately to comments and edits requested by the PSC will then be produced by the consultant.

7. Would the review committee consider extending the deadline for proposals to by one week so as to allow ample time to incorporate answers to the questions? *EXTENDED TO FRI APRIL 4.*